

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 12-18 are pending in the above application.

The Office Action dated December 18, 2006, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, claims 2-7, 12, 13, 17 and 18 were allowed, and claim 15 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view of Uchiyama. The newly cited reference to Muramatsu has been carefully reviewed, and it is believed that claims 14 and 16 patentably distinguish over this and the other art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 14 and 16 is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 14 requires a display device that includes a display panel having panel side connection wiring, a first wiring board having an insulating base, a driving circuit element for driving the display panel, a first wiring path connected to the driving circuit element, a second wiring path not connected to the driving circuit element and a third wiring path. Claim 14 also recites a second wiring board identical to the first wiring board and panel-side connection wiring connecting the second wiring path of the first wiring board to the first wiring path of the second wiring board. It is respectfully submitted 1) that Muramatsu does not show a second wiring path not connected to the driving circuit element as recited in claim 14, and 2) that a proper motivation for modifying Muramatsu in view of Uchiyama has not been identified and that therefore a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented. Each of these issues is addressed below.

With reference to Figure 2 of Muramatsu, Muramatsu includes input terminals 11 that are each connected to an input of LSI 4 by way of vias 13 and input lines 12. Corresponding pairs of input terminals on the left and right sides of circuit board 3 are also connected directly to each other by way of buses 14 (column 6, lines 49-67). Therefore, Muramatsu does not include any wiring paths that are not connected to LSI 4. Even buses 14 that provide a direct route for a signal to travel between the left and right side input terminals on the circuit board, for example, are electrically connected to driving circuit elements LSI 4 by the vias. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Muramatsu does not show a wiring path not connected to a driving

circuit element as stated in the Office Action, and claim 14 is submitted to be allowable over Muramatsu for at least this reason.

Moreover, because Muramatsu does not show a wiring path not connected to a driving circuit element, Uchiyama provides no suggestion for modifying Muramatsu. The fact that Uchiyama discusses wider bus lines for reduced resistance at column 20, line 63, as noted in the Office Action, in no manner suggests any modification to Muramatsu.

Finally, the proposed modification to Muramatsu would appear to render it unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, and one skilled in the art would not be motivated to make a such a change. MPEP 2143.01. Corresponding pairs of Muramatsu's inputs are connected to each other and to driving circuit element LSI 4. Connecting an input 11 on one of Muramatsu's boards to a non-corresponding input 11 on an adjacent board would thus connect non-corresponding inputs of two different driving circuit elements. However, the two wiring boards must be identical if the language of claim 14 is to be satisfied. Nothing in the record suggests that the identical driving circuit elements LSI 4 devices would operate if their inputs and outputs are crossed in this manner. Because the proposed modification would appear to render Muramatsu non-functional, and therefore unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, it is respectfully submitted that a motivation for modifying Muramatsu has not been provided and that claim 14 is allowable over the art of record for this reason as well. If this rejection is maintained, it is respectfully requested that the examiner explain how it is believed that Muramatsu would function if the inputs and outputs are crossed as suggested in the Office Action.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated December 18, 2006, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 2-7 and 12-18 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration of claims 14-16 and allowance of claims 2-7 and 12-18 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750)

Application No. 10/662,453
Amendment dated February 16, 2007
After Final Office Action of December 18, 2006


Docket No.: 4633-0107P

at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #37,750
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant